

Mr. Baxter's

JUDGMENT

AND

REASONS

Against Communicating with the

Parish - Assemblies,

As by L A W Required.

Impartially Stated and Proposed.

Great Men are not always Wise, &c. Job 32. 9.

Surely in vain the Net is spread in the sight of any Bird.

Prov. 1. 17.

Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth, Rom. 14. 22.

Printed in the Year 1684.

Mr. Barker's

JUDGMENT

AND

REASONS

Against Communicating with the

Rebels -

By A. W. Barker

Printed and Published

Printed and Published by
J. W. Barker, at the
Press of J. W. Barker,
No. 10, South Street,
New York.

Printed in the Year 1864.

TO THE
READER:

Thou art desired to consider, That the Reason why the Author of these Papers has given thee the Judgment of Mr. Baxter against communicating with the Parish - Assemblies, as by Law required, is to undeceive those who think, that he has been of late writing for it; whereas that which he hath written does hold good only on Supposition, the Parish Assemblies are Congregational Churches, independent on the Diocesane Bishop, who is for our holding Communion with them only as such.

It has very much grieved the Author to see how many have been led from their Principles by some men, who though otherwise Dissenters, have since the late vigorous Execution of the penal Laws, not only gone themselves to Church, but done their best to engage Others to do so too; and to that end have observed the Rule of the Polititian, To press the Examples and Practices of some Eminent Men, as a good means to draw on the rest. Thus have they published the Names of Nye, Robinson, Owen, and Goodwin to countenance their Communicating with the Parish Assemblies in the Liturgy - Worship, which is manifest Abusing those

A 2
Persons,

To the Reader.

Persons, while they are made to plead for a Practice they Disavow.

The Designe of the Publisher of Mr. Nye, Robinson, &c. (as he himself professeth) Is as well to satisfie those that scruple Communion with the Church [To wit, with the Parish Assemblies in their Liturgy - Worship] as to vindicate those who have complied; whereas there is not one of these men that spake a word in favour of Parish Communion.

Mr. Nye's and Mr. Robinson's Papers are ONLY for the Lawfulness of Hearing the Conformist Ministers preach, not for Communicating with the Parish in their Liturgy - Worship. Besides, it must be noted, That what they wrote was consigned to private Manuscript, until some Years after their Death, and never, it may be, designed for publick view. And the Author of A speedy Remedy against Spiritual Incontinency, pag. 4. doth assure us, 'That at Leyden, Mr. Robinson being confuted in the presence of above Three Hundred People, did revoke his Opinion about Hearing, and acknowledged that Hearing was a sinful partaking with that Ministry. That this was Nine Years before Mr. Robinson's Death, and that Mr. Robinson's Papers were not published in some years after his Death, and had not been published then neither, had they not through Inadvertency escaped the Flames, and fell into the hands of an Inveterate Enemy who printed them. Soon after they were printed, Mr. Cann wrote an Answer; notwithstanding which, the Papers are now Re-published, and Mr. Robinson's Authority urged to justify the LAWFULNESS o

Cor.

To the Reader.

Communicating with the Parish Assemblies in the Liturgy-Worship.

In like manner, Dr. Owen, who did grant that Forms of Prayers, in Thesi, may be lawful, is introduced as an Approver of the Lawfulness of the imposed Liturgy and Ceremonies in particular; than which there cannot be a greater Abuse.

Dr. Goodwin likewise, after the Diocesane Episcopacy was laid aside, did say, 'That in some of the *Parishes in this Kingdom there are many Godly *Men, that do constantly give up themselves to the *Worship of God in publick, and meet together *in one place, to that end in a constant Way, under *a Godly Ministry, whom they themselves have *chosen to cleave unto (though they did not chuse *him at first) These (saith the Doctor) notwithstanding their Mixture, and want of Discipline, I *never thought for my part, but that they were true *Churches of Christ, and Sister Churches, and so ought *to be acknowledged; And as for holding Communion *with them, I say, as Sister Churches, occasionally, as *Strangers, men might hold Communion with them. So far Dr. Goodwin.

Note here, 1st. That he describes a Church, which for its kind is Congregational, though in it there is a Mixture and want of Discipline. His discourse is of a compleat Congregational Church, not of an incomplete part of the Diocesane. 2^{dly}. He writes for our acknowledging 'em to be Sister Churches, and communicating with them occasionally as Strangers; but speaks not of our communicating with such Parish-Assemblies as are of the Diocesane Frame, nor of fixing
our

To the Reader.

our Communion there, as the Law now requires. 3dly, He insists only on the Faultiness of Mixture, and want of Discipline, not on the Liturgy-Worship, which sufficiently evinceth that he meant it of the Presbyterian Congregations, which had no Liturgy; not of the Episcopals which have. For whoever consults what he has in his Exposition on the Revelations, will find enough that shews how much he was against the Liturgy-Worship. But yet this Doctor's Judgment must be produced for the justifying our communicating with the Parish-Assemblies, that are but incomplete parts of a Diocesane single Church in their Liturgy-Worship, as by Law required.

Much after the same manner doth the Reverend Mr. Baxter deal with us, when he refers us to the Judgment of the Old Nonconformists, who though they were for Communion with the Parish-Assemblies then in being, yet esteemed the Diocesane kind of Churches, Ministry and Ceremonies to be Violations of the second Commandment, Idolatrous and Antichristian. And as to the controverted Ceremonies (for instance, Kneeling at the Sacrament) Mr. Baxter knows best how much he differs from several of them, to whom he refers us; for they assert these Ceremonies to be Antichristian and Idolatrous. But Mr. Baxter, notwithstanding the high Applauses he gives 'em, has openly relinquished their Doctrine, and fallen in with Morton and Burgesse, having also espoused that very Distinction of Primary and Secondary Worship, which they received from Bellarmine and Suarez; the insufficiency whereof has been long ago detected by Doctor Ames in his Reply and Fresh Suite.

Moreover,

To the Reader.

Moreover, it must be observed, that Mr. Baxter has not given us so full and distinct a state of the present Controversie, between him and those he calls Separatists, as was necessary; for, his Discourses for Communion with the Parish-Assemblies, without fuller Explanation, will (as now they are) be generally taken as if he meant it of the Parish Assemblies by Law established, which are in a kind destructive of Christ's Churches, Ministry and Discipline, as Mr. Baxter himself avers; whereby the weaker sort mistaking Mr. Baxter, are induced to conclude the established Constitution to be good. But what is this less than the casting a stumbling Block in the way of his weak Brethren?

These things then being so, 'tis become necessary that some-what be done to undeceive the World; and seeing Mr. Baxter is the Person on whose Authority most of those Dissenters who are now for Parish Communion, do lean, I have thought it expedient to lay before them an impartial state of Mr. Baxter's Judgment, as I find it in some of his late Writings, together with those Reasons that he doth furnish us with, (as Arrows which we may gather up to shoot back upon him) against communicating with the Parish Assemblies, as by Law required. The giving a just Account of Mr. Baxter's Judgment against Parish-Communion is, I acknowledge, but Argumentum ad hominem, adapted chiefly for the silencing Mr. Baxter; but the Reasons that are couched in what is given out of Mr. Baxter, are more than so, and such as must receive another Answer than merely the saying, That

To the Reader.

That Mr. Baxter is grown wiser, and hath changed his Judgment; for until Mr. Baxter or some other do validly answer what Mr. Baxter has said in his Five Disputations against Episcopacy and Ceremonies, and in his late Treatise against Episcopacy, what I have here urged will abide in its strength, and carry also with it the Authority and Weight of the Unanswerable Mr. Richard Baxter.

R. Baxter's

Mr. Baxter's Judgment and Reasons
against Communicating with the Parish
Assemblies, as by Law required, im-
partially stated and proposed.

THere has been of late no little stir about going to the Parish Assemblies, and communicating with them in their Liturgy-Worship, and in special *Mr. Baxter* hath been warmly engaged in the *Defence*, (as he himself will have it) of his own, and the Practice of those that are for Parish-Communion, and cannot suffer a little Manuscript, said to be *Dr. Owens*, to escape his Animadversions and Opposition. It is at this time no part of my Province to examine *Mr. Baxter's* Answer to *Dr. Owen's* Arguments; I call the Manuscript *Dr. Owens*, not only because common Fame directs me to do so, but because in the Arguments there is the Doctor's wonted *Accuracy* and *Strength*. There are very many Scripture-Reasons couch'd in a few Lines, and such as are too strong to receive any harm from *Mr. Baxter's* Answer, as I could by divine Assistance clearly evince: but at this time it shall be no part of my Work. In this, my aim is to shew, *What it is Mr. Baxter is really for*, that he is *as much against holding Communion with the Parish-Assemblies, as by Law required*, as those are, against whom he writes, and that we are furnished with unanswerable Arguments *against such Parish-Communion*, by *Mr. Baxter*.

Thus much will be made very manifest to a common
B Capacity,

Capacity, by shewing what are *Mr. Baxter's* avowed Principles about the *Institution, Ministry and Discipline of Christ's Churches*, and what are the natural consequences of those Principles he holds, and wherein lies the point, in which he differs from his Brethren. In doing which I will give you *Mr. Baxter's* sence, for the most part in his own words, directing you to the very pages of those Books of his I make use of.

‘§. 1. All Christians (saith *Mr. Baxter*) are agreed, that Christ is the Author of the Universal Church (consider'd both as *Baptized* or *Externally Covenanting*, call'd *Visible*, and as *Regenerate* and *sincerely Covenanting*, call'd, *Mystical*) as it is headed by Christ himself, and called his Body and special Kingdom.

‘§. 2. We doubt not but Christ has instituted the Office of the sacred *Ministry*, to be under him as a *Teacher, Ruler and High-Priest* of the Church, in *Teaching, Guiding and Worshipping*, and that he has instituted *holy Assemblies and Societies*, for these things to be exercised in. And that [a Society of *Neighbour Christians*, associated with such a *Pastor* or *Pastors*, for *Personal Communion*, even in such Doctrine, Discipline and Worship] is a Church-form of divine Institution.

‘§. 3. We know not of any proof that ever was produced that many Churches of the *first Rank*, must (of duty) make one fixt greater Compound Church by Association, whether *Classical, Diocesane, Provincial, Patriarchal* or *National*, and that God has instituted any such form, vide *Mr. Baxter's Nonconformists plea for peace*, p. 8. 12.

‘§. 4. Christ has stated on the Pastors of his Instituted Churches, the Power of Teaching Assemblies, and particular persons of leading them in publick Worship, and Sacraments, and of Judging by the power of the Keyes, whom

‘whom to receive into their Communion by Baptism, and profession of Faith, and whom to admonish, and for Obstinate Impenitance reject; and this Institution none may Alter.

§. 5. ‘He has Instituted Ordinary Assemblies, and stated particular Churches, as is aforesaid, for these Holy Exercises, and forbid all Christians to forsake them, and he and his Apostles, have appointed and separated the Lords day hereunto. None therefore may abrogate, or suspend those Laws; all this is proved, *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. *and* 16. 19. *and* 18. 18, 19. *Joh.* 20. 23. *Luke* 12. 37, 38. *Mat.* 21. 36, *and* 22. 4, 5. &c. *And* 24. 45, 46. *Heb.* 11. 25, 26. *Acts* 11. 26. 1 *Cor.* 14. *Ephes.* 4. 4. 10 17. 1 *Thes.* 5. 12, 13. *Heb.* 13. 7. 24. *Tit.* 1. 5, 6. &c. 1 *Tim.* 3. *Acts* 14. 23. *Acts* 20. 1 *Cor.* 16. 1. &c. Mr. Baxter *Ubi supra*, p. 24.

§. 6. ‘The Diocesane kind of particular Churches, which has only One Bishop over many score or hundred fixed parochial Assemblies, I take (saith Mr. Baxter) to be it self a Crime: Which in its very Constitution, overthroweth the Office, Church and Discipline, which Christ by himself, and his Spirit in his Apostles, Instituted: For 1. Parishes are made by them *no Churches*, as having no ruling Pastors, that have the power of judging whom to Baptize, or admit to Communion, or Refuse, but only are Chappels, having preaching Curates. 2. All the first Order of Bishops in single Churches are deposed. 3. The Office of Presbiters, is changed into Semi-presbiters. 4. Discipline is made impossible; Mr. Baxter’s *Church History of Bishops and Council abridged*, ch. 1. §. 54. The like he affirms in his five Disputa. of Church-Government, pag. 19. ‘As to the eight sort of Bishops (*viz.*) [The Diocesane, who assumeth the sole Govern-

'ment of many Parish Churches, both *Presbiters* and *Pöople*,] as ten, or twelve, or twenty, or more, as they used to do, even a whole Diocess, I take them (saith *Mr. Baxter*) to be *Intollerable and Destructive to the peace and happiness* of the Church, and therefore not to be admitted under Pretence of Order or Peace, if we can hinder them.

§. 7. 'This Diocesane Church Government, being *de facto*, established in this Kingdom, the parish Assemblies are not compleat particular Churches of the first Rank and Order, they are but *parts* of a Diocesane, which is *de facto*, established as a single Church, *In fine speciei*. That parish Assemblies are not particular Churches, is manifested from *Mr. Baxters* principles. For 1. *That Cement which is necessary to the being of a Church, is wanting.* 'And it is impossible (saith *Mr. Baxter* in his *Cathol. Concord*, p. 231.) 'to be a Church without the Cement of Consent.' If many be forced into a Temple, not Consenting, it is a Prison, 'they are not a Church if they Consent only to Meet on other Occasions, as for some Occasional Act of Religion, it is not thereby made a Church. If they be commanded to consent, and do not, and if it only be their Duty, it maketh them not a Church; but only proveth that they ought to be one: So far *Mr. Baxter*. And it is manifest, that in pursuance of Canon and Statute Law, the Parishes are *de facto*, settled as parts of a Diocesane Church; and whoever joyn themselves unto the Parish assemblies, as by Law required, consent to be of the Parish assembly, as it is a part of the Diocesane Church; this doth every Parish Minister, who swears Canonical Obedience; that is, Obedience to his Ordinary *secundum Canones*, and who is to rest so fully satisfied in the Diocesane Government, as to declare he will not endeavour, on any pretence: what ever the alteration of it. But to form the Parish assembly

bly.

183
bly into a compleat particular Church, is to make a *Substantial Alteration* in the *Diocesane Constitution*. Besides the *Vestries*, who (as *Mr. Baxter* saith) do after a sort represent the Parish Assembly, are also sworn to the *Diocesane Constitution and Government*, and therefore cannot be justly interpreted to consent to the Parish Assemblies, being a compleat particular Church; Whatever consent there is between the Minister and People, it must be supposed to be no other than what is agreeable to the *Diocesane Rule*, (i. e.) to be parts of the *Diocesane Church*, taking none for their Pastor but the *Diocesane Bishop*.

2. This *Parish-Assembly* doth not only want consent to make it a Church, but it has no *Parochial Pastor*, though the Pastor and Flock are the essential constitutive parts of a particular organized Church, yet its not to be found in our Parishes. It may be a Community (saith *Mr. Baxter*, ubi sup.) without a Pastor; not a Polity, not an Ecclesiastical Society. That the *Parish Minister* is not a Pastor, is manifest; for he is deprived of what is essential to the *Pastoral Office*. (This is evident (according to the Principles of *Mr. Baxter*) who distinguishing between the *Old* and *New Episcopacy*, and who though he had more favourable thoughts of the *Old* than of the *New*, and knows that the present is more like the *new* than the *old*, and consequently worse; yet writing against the restoring the *Old*, he lays down his fourth Argument thus,

4. That *Episcopacy*, which degradeth all the *Presbyters* in the Diocess, or causeth them to suspend an Essential part of their Office, is not to be restored under any pretence of the right Order of Peace. But such was the late *English Episcopacy*; And in his *Advertisement* to his *Five Disc.* p. 13, 14, &c. to satisfy those that make some doubt of the truth of the *Minor*, he saith, 'All men in England that
'knew

'knew but twenty years ago what belonged to these mat-
 'ters, are past doubt of it. And I have no mind to dis-
 'pute against them that contradict the common know-
 'ledge of the Nation, as if they should doubt whether
 'ever we had a King in England. 2. Read over the Ca-
 'nons, and the yearly *Visitation Articles*, which the
 'Church-Wardens swear to present by, before they had
 'ever read the Book, or heard what was in it. And then
 'judge, 3. Their Arguing for the *sole Jurisdiction of Bi-*
 '*shops*, and that they only were *properly Pastors*, and that
 '*Presbyters* had not the Key of *Discipline*, but of *Doctrine*,
 'is some Evidence.

'It is known to the Nation, that the Pastors of the Parish-
 'Churches had no power by their Laws, (or sufferance) to
 'cast out any the most erroneous Sinner or Heretick from
 'the Church, nor to bring them to open confession of their
 'sin, nor to absolve the Penitent, but by reading of their
 'Sentences, and publishing what they sent from their
 'Courts, and consequently could do nothing of all the
 'means hereunto; for the means cannot be used where
 'the end is known to be impossible. All the obstinate
 'scandalous Persons and scorners of a holy Life, we must
 'take as Members of our Churches, having no power to
 'cast them out. Indeed we had the same Power as the
 'Church-Wardens, to put our Names to the Presentments,
 'but a power of *Acausing* to a *Chancellors Court*, is not a
 'Power of *Governing*, especially when *Piety*, under the
 'Name of *Preciseness* and *Puritanism*, was so hated and
 'persecuted, that to have accused a man for meer Pro-
 'phaneness, would have been so far from obtaining the
 'end, as that it was like to have been the undoing of the
 'Accuser.

'Obj. But is not the power of *Discipline* given them in
 'their *Ordination*? *Ans.*

' *Answ. 1st. In their Ordination, the Bishop said to*
 ' *them [Receive the holy Ghost, whose Sins thou dost remit,*
 ' *they are remitted; whose Sins thou dost retain, they are re-*
 ' *tained]* and in the Book of Ordination it was asked them,
 ' *[Whether they would give their faithful Diligence alwayes to*
 ' *administer the Doctrine and Discipline of Christ, as the Lord*
 ' *has commanded, and as the Realm has received the same,*
 ' *according to the Commandments of God?]* And the Rubrick
 ' *of the Common-Prayer-Book enables the Curate to admonish*
 ' *open and notorious evil Livers, by whom the Congre-*
 ' *gation is offended; and those that have wronged their*
 ' *Neighbours, that they come not till they have openly*
 ' *declared, That they have repented and amended. But,*
 ' *1. This doth but serve to leave them inexcuseable that*
 ' *acknowledge Discipline to belong to the Office of a Pres-*
 ' *byter, when yet he might not excuse it. The Bishops*
 ' *in the Ordination of Presbyters enabled them to Preach*
 ' *the Gospel, and yet they were after that forbidden to*
 ' *preach, till they had a Licence, and it was put into the vi-*
 ' *sitation Article, to present those Ministers, that preach-*
 ' *ed without a Licence. If they will deny us the exercise*
 ' *of the power, that they first confesse belongeth to our*
 ' *Office, we are not answerable for their self-contradictions.*
 ' *2. By Discipline, I suppose they mean but our Instru-*
 ' *ction, and our publishing their Orders for Penance, Excom-*
 ' *munication, or Absolutions. 3. They were the Judges*
 ' *of the sence, of the Laws as far as the Execution requi-*
 ' *red, and the universal practice of England; which their*
 ' *Writings shewed us, to our cost, their Judgment; what*
 ' *good would it do us, if the Law had been on our side,*
 ' *while the Concurrent Judgment and Practice of the*
 ' *Governours denied it, and went against it? 4. He that*
 ' *has kept a man from the Sacrament, according to the*
 ' *plain*

'plain Words of the Rubrick, was to have been accountable for it at their Courts, and so likely to have been undone by it: So far *Mr. Baxter*. Which sufficiently shews that the Parish Minister is in his Judgment degraded and deprived of what is essential to the Pastors Office; for by taking from them the power of Church-Government they destroy the very Office of the Presbyters; for Ruling is as *Essential* to their Office as preaching; notwithstanding which, as *Mr. Baxter* proves, and expressly asserts, the *English Episcopacy*, taketh from the Presbyters the Power of Church Governing; see his *five Disput.* p. 39..

But if it had been only the *Exercise* of the Parish Presbyters Power that had been suspended, yet considering the Suspension is *statedly established* by *Law* or *Custom*, during the Life of the Minister, its a destroying his Office; saith *Mr. Baxter*; 'Though an Office may be *Unexercised* for a time on some special Reason, yet if it be *statedly suspended*, and that suspension established by *Law* or *Custom* during the Life of the Minister; this is *plainly* a *destroying* or *nulling* the Office it self, and not to be endured. And surely, the Exercise of the Pastoral power is *statedly* suspended, and the suspension is by *Law* or *Custom* established, during the Ministers Life, and therefore the Office is *null'd* and *destroyed*; that is, the parish Minister is not a Pastor, nor has the Parish Assembly any Pastor, it is not a particular Church.

All this *Mr. Baxter* saith, of the Old *English* Prelacy, and yet thinketh that the present is much worse than the Old. In his second *Defence of the Nonconformists*, p. 64. Dr. *Stall*. saying, *That there is no other reason of our Separation, because of the Terms of our Communion, than what was from the beginning of the Reformation.* *Mr. Baxter* Answers, 'To say, that we grant that there are no more Reasons now, than

'than were then, is *too bold an untruth*, there is more rea-
 'son (1.) From the *Quality* of the things imposed (2.) From
 'the designs and drifts of the Imposition. (3.) From the
 'effects. (4.) From the Aggravation of Conformity, as
 'in the Church that we must communicate with. (5.) From
 'the things which give us a *fuller cause for our Preaching and*
 '*Assemblies, viz.* The late general contrary Church state
 'and Engagement to it, &c. On these particulars *Mr. Baxter*
 'enlargeth; I will but just intimate what he saith on
 'some of them. (1.) As to things imposed now which
 'were not then. 1°. The *Vestry Act* was not then made,
 'by which so considerable part of the Parish Churches as
 'the *Vestries* are, are to renounce all Obligations, to endea-
 'vour any alteration of the Government of the Church,
 'from the Oath and Vow, called the Covenant; so that all
 'Reformation of Church Government, as so sworn, was
 'renounced by them, who in a sort represent the Parish
 'Church. 5. The Reordination of Ministers, Ordained
 'by Presbyters, was not then required, and made a Necessa-
 'ry condition of their Ministration and Church relation,
 '(even by them that confess Reordination Unlawful.) And
 'therefore Plainly intimateth the *Nullity*, of the first. —
 '2°. The Word [*Pastor*] as applied to Parish Mini-
 'sters, distinct from [*Curates*] was not then blotted out
 'of most places in the Liturgies, nor the 20th of the
 '*Acts*, as applied to *Presbyters* left out [*Take heed to your*
 '*selves, and to the Flock &c.*] in plain design to *Alter the Of-*
 '*fice and Parish Churches.* To all this let us add.

§. 8. 'That he that will hold *Communion* with a *Church*,
 'must consent to the *Ministry, Discipline and Worship* of
 'that *Church*, see *Cathol. Concord, ubi supra.* So that he
 'that will Communicate with the Parish Assemblies must

consent to the *Ministry, Discipline and Worship* of their *Assemblies*; that is, he must consent to the *Diocesane Pastor*, to the *Parish Semi-presbyters*, and to the *Parish Assemblies*, as being a part of the *Diocesane Church*, and to the *Diocesane Discipline*; for *de facto*, this is the Constitution and Frame of *Parish Assemblies*, they are but parts of the *Diocesane Church*, they are under no other Pastor but the *Diocesane Bishop*, have no other Minister than a *Semi-Presbyter*, who wants what is essential to the Pastoral Office, and the Assembly wants that *Cement of consent* that is necessary to the making e'm a compleat particular Church.

This being so, *May we by any Act or Deed contribute to the fixing and establishing the Diocesane Episcopacy amongst us?* I'll Answer according to sound Reason, in conjunction with Mr. *Baxter's* own Principles: If it were unlawful to restore the old English Episcopacy, its unlawfull to give countenance and strength to it, once restored; for the strengthening it, is but the continuation of the thing restored: and if we might not lawfully help forward, nor consent unto the Restoration of it, we may not lawfully fix it, when once restored; for all these Mischiefs that are said to be the Fruits of its Restoration, will be continued by a fixing it.

But according to Mr. *Baxter*, it was not lawful to restore the Old English Prelacy, much less Lawful to settle the New, which (he saith) is worse. His Reasons are many, e. g. 'It destroys the end of Government, 'and is certainly inconsistent with the necessary Government and Discipline, to be exercised in the Churches; 'It unavoidably causeth Separations and Divisions in 'the Church; it degradeth all the Presbyters in the
'Diocess,

‘Diocess, and destroys and nulls their Office; it is the
‘product of *proud Ambition* and *Arrogancy*, contrary to
‘the expresse command of Christ: It so far gratifieth
‘lazy Ministers, as to ease them of the most painful
‘part of their Work: It is contrary to the Word of
‘God, and Apostolical Institution, according to their
‘own Interpretation. Moreover, it *gratifieth the Devil*
‘*and Wicked Men*, not by an unavoidable Accident, but
‘by a *natural Necessity*; therefore (saith Mr. Baxter in
his *five Disput. pag. 32, to 50.*) not to be restored under
‘any pretence of the Order or Peace of the Church:
And for the same Reason (say I, according to Mr.
Baxters principles) not to be complied with, not to be
countenanced, not to be fixed and strengthened by us,
though now restored. Though the Order and Peace
of the Church be pretended, yet we must do nothing
that countenanceth or strenghtens the English Episcopacy,
we must not hold communion with them; for that is
to consent to the uninstituted species of their *Church,*
Ministry, Discipline and *Worship*. What then must we
do? May we separate without contracting the guilt
of Schisme? Take Mr. *Baxter’s* own Answer.

§ 9. ‘If any Prince would turn his *Kingdom,* or a
‘whole *Province, Diocess* or *Country,* into *one onely Church,*
‘and thereby overthrow all the *first Order* of Churches,
‘of Christs Institution, *which are associated for personal pre-*
‘*sent Communion,* allowing them no Pastors, that have the
‘power of the Keys, and all essential to their Office,
‘though he should allow parochial *Oratories* or *Chappels,*
‘which should be no true Churches, but parts of a Church,
‘it were no Schisme to gather Churches, within such a
church,

' Church, against the *Laws* of such a *Prince*; see *Nonconformists first plea for peace.* p. 52.

Thus according to *Mr. Baxters* principles, a separation from the Parish Assemblies, and an erecting particular Churches, according to Gospel Order, is not *Schism*. Our separation from the *Diocesane Constitution*, and from the Parish Churches, as but parts of the *Diocesane*, is justifiable, and not to be Condemned. Now the *Lay-Nonconformists* are fully perswaded, that the Law of the Land requires our coming to Church, our going to the parish Assemblies, as they are parts of the *Diocesane Church*, which *Mr. Bax.* saith they must not do.

This being so manifest, I presume the Reader will be querying about *Mr. Baxters* Practice, and late Writings, and say, *Why then does Mr. Baxter go to Church? Why doth he write so much for it, and cannot suffer a few Lines in Manuscript to pass without a publick Confutation? What! doth Mr. Baxter say and unsay, or is his Conscience against communicating with the parish Churches, and his Practice for it?* God forbid I should think so of one, whose Goodness and Learning both seem above the size of what is Ordinary: Really therefore that I might find out the Notion on which *Mr. Baxter* insists to satisfy himself, in holding communion with the parish Assemblies, even when he is so very much against them, as they are *but parts of the Diocesane Church*, I have taken some pains, and have been impartial in my Search, and I think I have found out the Notion he builds on, which I take to be this.

' *Mr. Baxter* distinguisheth between the many *Parish Churches*, and the *Diocesane*, and the *Church of England*, 'as constituted of such *Diocesane Churches*. The old

Non-

‘ *Nonconformists* commonly owned the *Parish Churches*,
 ‘ (and the *Church of England*, as made up of such)
 ‘ but not the *Diocesane*. It is therefore a Mistake,
 ‘ that owning the *Parish Churches* and *Worship*, is an
 ‘ owning of the present *Diocesane Constitution*. Mr. B. against
 Dr. O. p. 9.

So that Mr. *Baxter* distinguisheth between the *Church of England*, as it is made up of many particular compleat Churches that are *Parochial*, and as it is made up of many particular *Diocesane Churches*. And here it must be Noted,

1. That though Mr. *Baxter* supposes the *National Church of England* to fall under these two distinct considerations, yet *de facto*, its notorious that there are not two such *National Churches of England* existent; and in truth, its impossible that there should be two such Churches, *simul & semel*, existent in one Nation; for a *National Church* made up of many compleat *Parochial Churches*, is in its very constitution destructive of a *National Church* made up of many particular *Diocesane Churches*. Mr. *Baxter* himself confesseth, that the *Diocesane Church* made up of many *Parochial Assemblies*, and established as a single Church, *Infima species*, of the lowest Rank and Order, is destructive of the very constitution of *Parochial Churches*, and the *Diocesane Episcopacy* and *Discipline* destructive of the *Parochial*; and the same may be said, *è contra*, of the *Parochial*, it is destructive of the *Diocesane*. So that its impossible there should be in this Nation two distinct *National Churches*, the one made up of many *Parochial* compleat single Churches, the other made up of many *Diocesane* single Churches. If then the *National Church* be in pursuance of the Laws, *de facto*, settled as made up of
 of

of many *Diocesane single Churches* (whether this be of Divine or Humane Right, matters not) its impossible to joyn our selves to the Parish-Assemblies, as to compleat particular Churches. For what-ever *Mental Notions* we may have of the *Church of England*, our Notions cannot make the Constitution to be *de facto*, otherwise than it is; and all know that the *National Church* is *de facto*, a *National Church* made up of several *single Diocesane Churches*, and that there is no *National Church of England* existent made up of many compleat Parochial Churches. But,

2. Suppose one Parish Assembly, or more, should form and frame themselves into compleat single Churches, and the People should consent to take the Parish Minister for their Pastor, and the Minister should exercise the whole power of a Pastor in this Parish Church. If this be so, it's acknowledged that Mr. Baxter may hold communion with this Parish Church, and not own the present Diocesane Constitution: But then it will also unavoidably follow, that this Parish Church cuts it self off from the National settled Order, it is a *Dissenting Church*; for it hereby ceases to be a part of the Diocesane Constitution, it is no more under the Pastoral Over-sight of the Diocesane Bishop, but assumes to it self all that Pastoral Power that in pursuance of Canon and Statute Law is fixed in the Bishop; so that this Parish Church is not established or allowed by the Law, but is a *Dissenting Congregation*, of the same Nature, Form and Constitution with that of other *Dissenting Churches*; for the species of these *Parochial Churches Constitution, Ministry and Discipline* is the same with theirs, and as perfectly inconsistent with that of the Diocesane, and by

by the *Church of England's* Representative declared to be *No True Church*, and the *Minister* and *Vestry*, who consent to this Alteration, do act contrary to their several *Declarations* and *Oaths*, and are by the Canons Excommunicate, and their Assemblies declared *Conventicles*.

In the 11th Canon, whose Title is [*Maintainers of Conventicles censured*] its express, 'That whosoever shall hereafter affirm or maintain, that there are within this Realm *Other Meetings, Assemblies* or *Congregations* of the King's born Subjects, than such as by the Laws of the Land are held and allowed, which may rightly challenge to themselves the Name of true and lawful Churches, let him be Excommunicated, and not Restor'd, but by the Arch-Bishop, after his Repentance and publick Revocation of such his Wicked Errors. And in *Can. 12.* 'Whosoever shall affirm, That it is lawful for any sort of *Ministers* and *Lay-Persons*, or either of them to joyn together and make Constitutions in causes Ecclesiastical, without the King's Authority, and shall submit themselves to be ruled and governed by them, Let them be Excommunicated, *ipso facto*, and not be restored until they Repent, and publickly revoke those their Wicked and *Anabaptistical* Errors. And in *Canon 73.* where the Title is [*Ministers not to hold private Conventicles*] it is thus ordained; 'For as much as all Conventicles and secret Meetings of Priests and Ministers, have been ever justly accounted very hurtful to the state of the Church wherein they live, We do now ordain and constitute, That no Priests or Ministers of the Word of God, nor any other Persons shall meet together in any private House, or *else-where*, to consult upon
'any

‘any matter or course to be taken by them, or upon
 ‘their motion or direction by any other, which may any
 ‘way tend to the impeaching or depraving of any part
 ‘of the *Government and Discipline now established in the*
 ‘*Church of England*, under pain of Excommunication,
 ‘*ipso facto*.

So that those Parish Assemblies that are erected in other manner than according to the Diocesane Constitution, and made compleat particular Churches, they are as such no more a part of the settled National Order, than the present dissenting Congregations, but are by the Canons declared to be Conventicles, and the Ministers and People that have had a hand in the framing their Parishes into this Order, are *ipso facto*, excommunicated. This then being so, I desire it to be observed, that when Mr. B. joyns with these Parish-Assemblies, Thus constituted, his Communion is still confined unto the Dissenters Congregations, he doth not hereby hold any Communion with the *Church of England*, any more than the *Dissenters* do; for his Communion with these *Parish Churches*, is with them as they are erected, *in Opposition* unto and destruction of the *National settled Order*, which is *Diocesane*.

To undeceive the World then, I must tell them (and Mr. Baxter cannot deny it,) that Mr. Baxter is no more for the joyning with the Parish Assemblies, as they are parts of the settled *National Church*, than the congregational Dissenters are, That when he goes to *Church*, he holds no other Communion with the *Church of England* than they do who go not to Church; for his Communion is still confin'd to a dissenting *Parish Church*, erected as much contrary to the Law

of the Land, as their Congregations are. Its true, he joyns with them in some part of the Liturgy, and so goes farther then they, but he holds not Communion with the *Church of England*, as it is a *Church of Legal Establishment*, any farther than they do. For he Esteems the *Church of England*, as by Law established, to be destructive of that kind or Species of those Churches, Ministry and Discipline, which is of Christs Institution, and Parochial or Congregational. Mr. Baxter and they (I say) are agreed in their dissent and separation from the *Parish Assemblies*, as they are parts of the settled *National Order*, and differ about the *Frame of Parochial Assemblies*; for Mr. Baxter supposes them to be what (*consideratis considerandis*) other Dissenters judge Impossible.

To make this as plain as possible I can, it must be observed, that Mr. Baxter affirms the *Parish Assemblies* to fall under a *Twofold Consideration*; They must be looked on, either as they are compleat particular *Congregational Churches*, independant on the *Diocese*, or as they are incompleat parts of, and dependant on the *Diocese*. Now as the *Parish Assemblies* are parts of the *Diocese*; they are not by any means to be owned or approved, but as they are particular *Congregational Churches*, so they are to be communicated with and owned.

This is Mr. Baxter's Judgment; but on the other hand, his Dissenting Brethren hold, that though *Parochial Assemblies* may be actually formed and framed according to the *Congregational Constitution*, that is, an Assembly of good Christians living in a Parish, may give up themselves to God, and associate themselves for personal Communion in the *Doctrine, Discipline and Worship of Christ*, chusing a Pastor and other Officers; for this end

D

the

the parish Assembly may consent to be of such a Constitution, and may chuse a Pastor, and in this Assembly all the Ordinances of Christ may be regularly Administered, and Discipline duely exercised. This may be, but though it may be so, yet they affirm that the Parish Assemblies are not thus constituted, their Constitution is not *Congregational*, but *Diocesane*. They are not a compleat Church, but incompleat parts of the *Diocesane*; there is no such consent as is necessary to constitute such a Church; but a consent to be what the Law directs 'em to be; they have no Pastor amongst them, as a *Congregational Church* has, nor are they independant on the *Diocesane*, as the *Congregational* is. They are not a particular Church of Christs Institution: Though they may be a sound part of the Catholick Church, or of the Christian Kingdom, yet they are not an Instituted Church, they are not a true particular Church, and therefore it is impossible any should communicate with them, as with such a Church. Whatever we may fancy them to be they alwayes remain the same, our Imaginations cannot make any change on their Constitution, our Mental Conceptions are but *Immanent Acts*, *Et Nihil penunt in esse*. Think any man what he will of the Church of England, *de facto*, it remains the same, *viz.* A National Church made up of many single *Diocesane Churches*, *Infima speciei*, of the lowest Rank and Order; for which reason its Impossible for any to joyn with the Church of England, as made up of many single compleat *Parochial Churches*; we cannot Communicate with it as such, because it is not so made; there is not any one Parish thus Constituted. Let *Mr. Baxter* direct them to that Parish, that is thus framed, that is,

a particular compleat Church of Christs Institution, and he would do somewhat, but till then, although there be some such Parish Churches, it is to them as if there were none such; for [*de non Apparentibus et non existentibus eadem est ratio.*] Besides they say, That if there be any such Parochial Congregational Church actually existent in this Kingdom, and the Minister and People privately declare so much, they think, that if without an open profession of their Church constitution, as different from the National established Order, their Communicating with them must be interpreted a Communicating with them as they are a part of the settled National Order, which is Diocesane, which cannot be done without an owning the present Diocesane Constitution. But if such a profession be made, they communicate not with the Church of England, but with a Congregation of Dissenters, from the National Constitution. Farthermore, some are afraid, that the erecting such Parish Assemblies, cannot be without the Ministers and Vestry Mens contracting the guilt of Perjury. In fine, I must again beseech the Reader to fix it in his thoughts, *That the Church of England, as made up of many single Diocesane Churches, is not in Mr. Baxter's Judgment a true Church*; Though it be a sound part of the Church Universal; yet the Diocesane Churches, which make up the National, and which in pursuance of the Law are, *de facto*, settled and established, are not true Churches. Mr. Baxter doth hold that the Parish Assemblies, as parts of Diocesane Churches, are not true Churches;

for they have not Pastures, as has been largely proved, and its no Schism to deny 'em, the *Communion* proper to a true particular Church. What *Mr. Baxter* saith of a Parish, that wants a Pastor, on the account of the Peoples not consenting to one imposed on 'em; the same may be said of that Parish, whose Minister wants what is essential to the Pastoral Office; and *This* all Parish Ministers according to the settled National Order do want, and therefore it may be said, 'That that *'Parish Church is no Parish Church*, in the proper political Organized sense, as we now speak of a Church, as constituted by the Governing and Governed part. For that which wanteth an essential part wanteth the Essence. And therefore it is 'no Schism to pronounce it no such Church, [i. e. 'no true Church of Christs Institution] and to deny 'it the Communion proper to such a Church. *Mr. Baxters Nonconformist plea for peace, p. 82.*

This then is *Mr. Baxters* Judgment, touching the *Diocesane Churches*, as by Law established. He cannot consent unto them; nor hold Communion with them as such. For the very kind and frame of their Churches is false, so is their Ministry, and Discipline, even destructive of Christs Churches, Ministry and Discipline.

§. 10. 'A Congregation or Nation of Men' (saith *Mr. Baxter*) of eminent Sanctity and Order, sound Doctrine and Worship, may by humane frailty take some one Falshood or Uncertain thing to be necessary to Ministry or Communion,

'munion, (as they say, some Churches unhapily
 'of late reject all that own not the Antiquity of
 'the Hebrew points) I cannot have local Communi-
 'on with that Church, (saith he) for they will
 'not receive me, unless I subscribe either a false-
 'hood, (or that which I judge false) but yet I high-
 'ly honour and Love 'em, and have mental Ca-
 'tholick Communion with them, when perhaps
 'necessity makes me joyn with a Church of
 'far worse Men and Order, that will impose
 'no sin on me. Mr. Baxter's *Schism Detected*,
 pag. 56.

In pursuance of this principle Mr. Baxter layes
 down, his Brethren separate from the Church of
 England; for there are several things which they
 Judge unsound, that are made necessary to their
 Communion with them. By *Cannon 27*. 'No
 'Minister, when he celebrateth the Communion
 'shall wittingly Administer the same to any but
 'such as *Kneel*, under pain of *Suspension*, nor under
 'the like pain to any that refuse to be present at
 'publick Prayers, according to the Orders of the Church
 'of England; that 'tis according to the 18th. Canon,
 'The Communion must not be administered
 'to him, that will cover his Head in the
 'Church or Chappel, in time of Divine Service, or
 'that doth not Reverently *Kneel*, when the general
 'Confession, Lettany and other Prayers are read,
 'and shall not stand up at the saying of the Belief,
 'or refuse to make due and lowly Reverence, when
 'the Name of the Lord Jesus shall be mention-
 'ed, in time of Divine Service, or refuse to say
 'in

‘in due place, and audibly with the Minister,
 ‘the Confession, the Lords Prayer, and the *Creed*,
 ‘or not make such other Answers, to the pub-
 ‘lick Prayers, as are appointed in the Book of
 ‘*Common-prayer*. Whoever refuseth these things,
 he is one who though present at the publick Pray-
 ers, yet not according to the *Orders* of the *Church*,
 is not to be admitted to the *Communion*, that is,
 all those things are made *necessary* to the Commu-
 nion: And here it must be observed, that though
 the admitting notorious Offenders to the Communion
 be forbidden by the *26th Canon*, yet not under the
 penalty of *Suspension*, as it is in this case of admit-
 ting those who refuse to Kneel, or to be present
 at the publick Prayers, according to the *Orders* of
 the Church of England.

But these things several Dissenters for great Rea-
 sons refuse to do, I’ll at this time only insist on
 the Ceremony of *Kneeling* at the Sacrament, and
 give the Reasons of some Learned Men against it.
 1st. Let us hear *Mr. Baxter* in his *five Disput.*
 p. 410, 411. ‘As for Kneeling at the Sacrament, I
 ‘doubt not at all but the Imposing it, and that on
 ‘such Rigorous Terms, tying all to it, and casting
 ‘all out of the Communion of the Church, or
 ‘from the participation of the Sacrament, that
 ‘durst not use it, was a very greivous Sin, and
 ‘tended to Persecution, and Injustice, and Church
 ‘dividing. It is certainly in a doubtful case the
 ‘safest way to do as *Christ*, and his *Apostles*, and
 ‘the *Universal Church* did for many hundred Years;
 ‘either the Gesture is *Indifferent in it self*, or not; If
 ‘it

'it be, how dare they thus divide the Church by
 'it, and cast out Christians that scruple it, when
 'they have these and many other Reasons of their
 'Scruples (which for brevities sake I omit)? If
 'they say, That *Kneeling* is of it self Necessary,
 'and not Indifferent, because it is *Reverent*. [Now
 if the Reader considers the *Rubrick* added in the
 New Common-Prayer-Book, he will find that
Kneeling is enjoyn'd for a *Signification of our humble
 and grateful Acknowledgment of the Benefits of Christ
 therein received, and for avoiding such Prophanation
 and Disorder in the holy Communion, as might other-
 wise ensue.* Thus we see the Gesture of *Kneeling*
 is made a *Reverent Gesture*, necessary to avoid
 Disorder and Prophanation. But sayes Mr. Baxter,
 if Kneeling is of it self necessary, and not indif-
 ferent, because it is *Reverent*] Then, '1st, They
 'make *Christ an imperfect Law-giver.* 2^{dly}, They
 'make himself or his Apostles, or both, to have
 'been *Sinners.* 3^{dly}, They condemn the Catholick
 Church of Sin: 4^{thly}, They condemn the Ca-
 'nons of the chief General Councils. All which
 'are Consequents that I suppose they will disown.
 'What a perverse preposterous *Reverence* is this!
 'when they have leave to lie in the Dust before
 'and after the very Act of Receiving, through all
 'their Confessions and Prayers; yet they will at
 'other times stand, and many of them sit at
 'Prayer, and sit at singing Psalms of Prayer
 'and Praise to God, and yet when Christ doth
 'invite them to a Feast, they dare not imitate
 'his Apostles and Universal Church in their
 'Gesture,

‘Gesture, lest they should be sinfully Irreverent. So far Mr. Baxter.

Now though Mr. Baxter is accurate in distinguishing, and as to the part of the Receiver, may yet see how to answer all these Arguments, and satisfy himself in kneeling, yet he cannot but believe, that Godly and Judicious men may be so far under the powerful Convictions of such Arguments against the Imposition, as to be unable to satisfy their Consciences in complying with the Gesture of Kneeling. Surely Mr. Baxter tells the World so much in his first *Nonconformists plea for Peace*, p. 150, 151, 152.

‘Some Nonconformists (saith he) *Lay and Clergy*, judge *Kneeling*, as things now stand, *Unlawful*: Their Reasons are, 1. In Doubtful cases *Duty* lieth on the surest side; but this to them is a doubtful case on one side, and to imitate Christ’s Institution by such sitting, as men use to do at Meat, is certainly lawful.

2. Because they think Kneeling *violateth the Reasons of the second Commandment*, being used where by whole Countries of Papists round about us, and many among us, it signifieth *Bread-Worship*, or *Idolatry* by the same Action, at the same Season used. For they suppose that the second Commandment forbiddeth *Images*, as being external corporal *Idolatry*, and *symbolizing* scandalously with *Idolaters*, though the Mind intend the Worship of God alone: And such they think this Kneeling is, and that encourageth the Papists. So far Mr. Baxter.

2. I'll only add one Argument more, which I find in a Proposition concerning *Kneeling*, joyned to Mr. Bradshaw's *Twelve Arguments*, which is taken from the *Abuse of Kneeling* in this Ordinance, by the *Papists*. 'Tis there said, 'That the Apostle, 'to Reform an *Abuse* which crept (even in their 'Times) into Love-Feasts, which were immedi- 'ately before or after the Lords Supper, did banish 'them thence, and reduced the manner of Admi- 'nistring the Lords Supper to the first Institution, 'saying, *Shall I praise you in this? I praise you 'not; for I have received of the Lord that which I 'delivered unto you, &c.* 1 Cor. 11. ver. 22, 23. 'Whereby it is apparent, That that form of Ad- 'ministration which differeth from the first Insti- 'tution, is *worthy no Praise*, and therefore no ac- 'ceptable Service to God. For if the Apostle 'would not tolerate an Indifferent thing (as was 'a *Love-Feast* till then) to continue so near the 'Lords Supper, when it was abused, how would 'they allow the change of *Sitting* into *Kneeling*, 'especially in these two Considerations?

'*First*, Because the abuse of *Love-Feasts* (*viz.* 'Superfluity) was never so great and scandalous in 'the Apostles time, as the abuse of *Kneeling* (*viz.* 'Idolatry) was and is in the Synagogue of *Rome*. 'And besides, *Love-Feasts* were either before or 'after the Lords Supper; whereas *Kneeling* is in 'the principal part of the Holy Communion. 'Therefore if the Apostle banished *Love-Feasts* 'from the Lords Supper, because of the *Abuse*, 'and brought the Church to the Simplicity of the

'first Institution, is it not a tempting Sin to retain
 'the *Idolatrous Kneeling* of Papists, and reject the
 'exemplary Sitting of our Master Christ? And
 'the rather because it is in that Sacrament, and
 'in that *part* of the Sacrament which especially
 'setteth forth our communion with Christ and
 'his Church, and is therefore called the *Communion*-----Doth not God strictly forbid us to
 'serve him as *Idolaters* do their Gods? The
 'which considered, can Kneeling, wherewith
 'Papists honour their *Breaden God*, be honour-
 'able to *Christ* in his holy Sacrament?

For such Reasons, many are convinced, that
Kneeling at the receiving the *Communion* is Unlaw-
 ful; and seeing without Kneeling they cannot
 have Communion with the *Church of England*,
 they cannot locally communicate with her, but
 yet highly honour her for the soundness of her
 Doctrine, and do mentally hold *Catholick Com-*
munion with her, so far as she agrees with the
Catholick Church; but Necessity makes them to
 with-hold local Communion from them. To
 make this yet more clear, the Reader must Ob-
 serve, that the Argument Mr. Baxter doth fur-
 nish them with, runs thus, *It is not lawful to com-*
municate with those that impose Sinful Terms of
Communion: This Mr. Baxter affirms. But the
Church of England imposeth many things as *Terms*
of Communion with them, which they think are sin-
 ful. Ergo They must not communicate with them.
 Now in the Minor Mr. Baxter and they differ;
 he thinks the things they scruple (for instance,

Kneeling)

Kneeling) are Lawful, but yet proposes strong Arguments against the Lawfulness of Kneeling; which Arguments, though not Convincing unto him, yet are so unto them. And therefore whatever is his Liberty, it is their Duty to withhold their Communion from the Church of England, still honouring her for the soundness of her Doctrine, &c.

§. 11. *Mr. Baxter* in his *Schism detected*, p. 40. affirms, 'That he who is unjustly cast out of the Church, and by its very Laws Excommunicated, *ipso facto*, is no damned nor sinful Schismatick, for Worshipping God in a Church, that will receive him.

'But according to the Judgment of *Mr. Baxter*, Protestant Dissenters, are unjustly cast out of the Church of England, and by its very Laws, *ipso facto*, Excommunicated. Ergo they are not Sinful Schismaticks.

When *Mr. Baxter* speaks of going to another Church, *Mr. Baxter* must be understood to mean a withholding Communion from the Excommunicating Church, and communicating with another, whose Laws do not, *ipso facto*, Excommunicate. The which being so, the Argument against *Mr. Baxter* is valid for the acquitting their Separation from the Guilt of Sin.

§. 12. There is another Argument which *Mr. Baxter*, in Conjunction with *Dr. Sherlock* gives us, and which will acquit the Lay-Dissenter from Sin,

and it is this; ' *It is no Sin, but a Duty to with-hold Communion from a Schismatical Church:* This Dr. Sherlock doth over and over assert. *But the Church of England is a Schismatical Church,* saith Mr. Baxter. It is a Schismatical Church, it is guilty of haneous and aggravated Schisme. Mr. Baxter in his *first Plea*, p. 41. saith,

§. 14. ' If any Proud, or Passionate, or Error-
'neous Person do, as *Diotrephes*, cast out the Bre-
'thren undeservedly, by unjust *Suspensions*, *Silen-*
'*cings* or *Excommunications*, it is TYRANNICAL
'SCHISME, what better Name soever cloaks
'it. If any should make *sinful Terms of Communion*
'by *Laws* or *Mandates*, imposing things forbidden
'by God, on those that will have communion
'with them, and expelling those that will not so
'fin; this were HANEIOUS SCHISME;
'And the further those Laws extend, and the more
'Ministers or People are cast out by them, the
'greater is the Schisme.

§. 15. ' If any should not only Excommunicate such
'Persons for not complying with them in sin, but also
'prosecute them with *Mulcts*, *Imprisonments*, *Banish-*
'*ments*, or other Prosecution, to force them to trans-
'gress; this were yet more haneously aggravated Schism.

§. 16. ' All those would be deeply guilty of such
'Schism, who by *Talk*, *Writing* or *Preaching* justifie
'it, and cry it up, and draw others into the Guilt,
'and reproach the Innocent as *Schismatics*, for not of-
'fending God. [Then look to your self, good Mr.

Baxter,

Baxter, reflect on your Talk and Writing, and clear your self from the guilt of Reproaching the Innocent as *Schismaticks*, if you can.] But I'll proceed :

§. 17. 'If any should corrupt such a Church, or its 'Doctrines, Worship or Discipline, in the very *Essentials*, by setting up *forbidden Officers* and *Worship*, or 'casting out the Officers, Worship or Discipline instituted by Christ, and then prosecute others for not 'communicating with them, would be yet the *more Haneous Schisme*.

§. 18. 'If either of the last named sorts would not be 'contented with *mens communion* with them, but would 'also *silence* and *prosecute* such as will not *own*, *justifie* 'and *consent* to all that they do by *Subscriptions*, *Declarations*, *Covenants*, *Promises* or *Oaths*, this would 'be yet *more aggravated Schism*. So far *Mr. Baxter*.

Now let any impartial Reader compare what is here said, with what else-where *Mr. Baxter* accuses the *Church of England* of, and he'll find all this to be but his *Description of the Church of England*, which according to the general import of his Writings, must be looked on as guilty of *Haneous*, *Aggravated* and *Tyrannical Schism*, that is, to be deeply Schismatical ; and therefore, according to *Dr. Sherlock*, not to be communicated with.

But I'll draw to a close, beseeching the *Reader* to consider well what *Mr. Baxters* judgment is, about communicating with the *Parish-Assemblies*, by Law established, how much he is against it, and what are some of his Reasons, and he will find,

I. That

I. That *Mr. Baxter* is as much against communicating with the Parish-Assemblies, as by Law required, as his Brethren are. The Parish-Assemblies, by Law established, are Diocesane, and with them, as such, *Mr. Baxter* communicates not. But first fancies the Parish Assembly to be a *Congregational Church*, and the Parish Minister to be an *Independant Pastor*, exempt from the spiritual Jurisdiction of the Diocesane Bishop, and then holds communion with it as such, that is, he either communicates with it as if it were what indeed it is not, or if it be really such a Church as he fancies it to be, his communion with it is only as 'tis a Church separated from the National settled Order: For the Parish Assembly, as a part of the National settled Order, is no Church, it has no Pastor, &c.

II. That *Mr. Baxter's* communion is no more *Catholick* than theirs; though he talks more of the *Name*, he has no more of the thing than they have. Doth he hold *Catholick Communion* mentally with the Universal Church? so do they. Do they withhold mental communion from Parish-Assemblies, as by Law established (*i. e.*) as they are parts of the Diocesane institution? So doth *Mr. Baxter*. Are the Communications, to which their local Communion is confined, of a Constitution different from, and *independent* on the *Diocesane*? So is the Parish Church with which *Mr. Baxter* communicates, if it be really what he fancieth it to be; so that his *Local Communion* is as much confined to *Dissenting Assemblies* as theirs is.

This is on a Supposition that *Mr. Baxters* Imaginations were operative, *ad extra*, and would make a real change on the Constitution. But if the Parish Assembly continues, *de facto*, as established, then I must say,

III. That Mr. Baxter holds both those Premises, from which a conclusion (justifying their separation) doth naturally follow. The Premises are these; *It is our undoubted Duty to separate from the Corruptions that are in the Parish Assemblies. But the very Constitution of the Parish Assemblies and Ministry, by Law established, are Corruptions.* These are Mr. Baxter's Premises. And let the World judge whether this Conclusion [namely, *That it is our undoubted Duty to separate from the Parish Assemblies and Ministry, as by Law established*] doth not naturally flow from them, justifying a with-holding Communion from the Parish Assemblies. In fine, it must be observed, that if the Parish Assemblies be really *de facto*, but parts of the Diocesane Church, and no compleat Churches, Mr. Baxter must justify the Separation, and that he doth so, I will give you his own words, as I find 'em in his *Schism detected*, p. 28. 'Either our Parish Churches (saith he) are true Churches, or not; if not, the Separatists are so far in the Right, and separate not from true Churches, *eo nomine*, because they separate from them: so far Mr. Baxter; who, if the Parish Assemblies be but parts of the Diocesane Constitution, and not true compleat particular Churches, justifies the separation from 'em; And who knows not, that the Parish Assemblies, as by Law established, are but parts of the Diocesane?